

which is a huge corporation. But the benefit that the American taxpayers receive are the thousands of jobs that Boeing provides in order to export this plane to China who pays for it. If indeed there was some problem, we can always go and get the airplanes back.

It is not like we are giving something away. We are creating jobs. I might tell my colleagues that many of those Boeing jobs are located in the State of Alabama.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 263, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) will be postponed.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Payne amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the UN World Food Program (WFP) last Tuesday expressed fears of a "worsening humanitarian crisis" in southern Sudan, resulting from the inability to transport food to those who need it. This ban has made most of the region inaccessible to relief agencies trying to deliver urgent humanitarian assistance to some 150,000 people.

Mr. Chairman, the funds appropriated by this amendment which is more than \$4,000,000 will be used for rehabilitation and economic recovery in areas of Sudan which have endured many hardships due to their religious and political beliefs. These funds will help support education, crop growth and other needs necessary for the basic existence of these people.

Mr. Chairman, this is a humane, well thought out, gesture offered by the gentleman from New Jersey and I urge all Members to support this amendment.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TANCREDO) having assumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2606) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON H.R. 2670, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. CALLAHAN, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-283) on the bill (H.R. 2670) making appropri-

tions for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PAUL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ALLEN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MORELLA addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BRYANT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BRYANT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SHERMAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Florida addressed the House. His remarks will appear

hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

\$800 BILLION TAX CUT, BUT NOT FOR THE MIDDLE OR LOWER CLASSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that I am making friends with all of the members of the staff by taking 5 minutes at this hour, including the Speaker, but since I have stayed here this long, I will take the 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we are told that this is the week that the main business is going to be, for this Congress, is the final passage of an \$800 billion tax cut.

The Republican leadership says that their tax cut, at least that one which passed the House of Representatives, is for the middle class. But I would like to raise that question. The bill which passed the House of Representatives about 2 weeks ago had the following features: the 1.25 million taxpayers representing the 1 percent wealthiest, richest portion of the population each, on average, got \$54,000 of tax reduction. Those are the 1 percent whose incomes are more than \$300,000 per year.

At the other end of the scale, starting from the bottom, from the lowest income person in this society issuing a tax return, if we took all 95 percent, starting from the lowest income and coming up to an income of \$125,000 a year, all 95 percent of that population, all 120 million would have received 39 percent of the total tax cut; whereas, the 1.25 million, the wealthiest 1.25 million, or 1 percent, would have received 45 percent of that total tax reduction. The 1 percent richest of Americans got more than all 95 percent of our population whose income is beneath 125,000.

If I may put that in a slightly different way, if those who may still be watching would consider 100 people, 100 people, one of whom has income over \$300,000 and consider that we might have \$100 of tax reduction to be able to distribute among those 100 people, that that one person whose income is greater than \$300,000 would get \$45 of the total of \$100 that is available for all tax reduction for all Americans.

□ 2300

Whereas 95 people, starting at the lowest income, up to the persons who might have \$125,000 of income, that group of 95 people would find that they were able to receive only a total of \$39 divided among the 95 of them.

Now, I do not know how many people would believe that that was a fair distribution that would suggest that this tax cut was for the middle class. That is hardly a middle class tax cut. In fact, it is designed to make the already rich a great deal richer. And that the middle class, those people between incomes of \$20,000 and perhaps \$80,000 per year, would receive \$1 or \$2 a day, hardly a middle class tax cut.

But that is only a small part of the story. The rest of the story is what the